arXiv:1406.2013v3 [math.PR] 12 Sep 2015

Further study on Hunt's hypothesis (H) for Lévy processes

Ze-Chun Hu
College of Mathematics, Sichuan University, Chengdu, 610064, China
E-mail: zchu@scu.edu.cn

Wei Sun
Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Concordia University,
Montreal, H3G 1M8, Canada
E-mail: wei.sun@concordia.ca

Abstract Getoor's conjecture that essentially all Lévy processes satisfy (H) is a long-standing open problem in potential theory. In the beginning of the paper, we summarize the main results obtained so far for the problem. Then, we present two new necessary and sufficient conditions for the validity of (H). Furthermore, we give applications of these new criteria. First, we give explicit constructions of Lévy processes satisfying (H) in a context where previously known results could not be applied. Second, we show that a large class of pure jump subordinators can be decomposed into the summation of two independent subordinators such that both of them satisfy (H).

Keywords Hunt's hypothesis (H), Getoor's conjecture, Lévy process, subordinator.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) Primary: 60J45; Secondary: 60G51

1 Introduction

A Lévy process on $\mathbf{R}^n$ is said to satisfy Hunt's hypothesis (H) if every semipolar set is polar. About fifty years ago, Professor R.K. Getoor raised the problem that for which Lévy processes semipolar sets are always polar. His conjecture that essentially all Lévy processes satisfy (H) is the major open problem in the field of potential theory for Lévy processes (cf. e.g. [1, page 70]).

Let us start with a brief introduction to Hunt's hypothesis (H). For simplicity, we consider here only (H) for Lévy processes; however, we should point out that

(H) plays a crucial role in the potential theory of (dual) Markov processes. We refer the readers to [3, Chapter VI] for a systematic introduction to (H) for Markov processes.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be a probability space and $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a Lévy process on $\mathbf{R}^n$ with Lévy-Khintchine exponent ψ, i.e.,

$$E[\exp\{i\langle z, X_t\rangle\}] = \exp\{-t\psi(z)\},\ z \in \mathbf{R}^n, t \geq 0.$$

Hereafter E denotes the expectation with respect to P, $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ and $|\cdot|$ denote respectively the Euclidean inner product and norm of $\mathbf{R}^n$. The classical Lévy-Khintchine formula tells us that

$$\psi(z) = i\langle a, z\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle z, Qz\rangle + \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \left(1 - e^{i\langle z,x\rangle} + i\langle z, x\rangle 1_{\{|x|<1\}}\right)\mu(dx),$$

where $a \in \mathbf{R}^n, Q$ is a symmetric nonnegative definite $n \times n$ matrix, and μ is a measure (called the Lévy measure) on $\mathbf{R}^n\backslash\{0\}$ satisfying $\int_{\mathbf{R}^n\backslash\{0\}}(1 \wedge |x|^2)\mu(dx) < \infty$. We use $\mathrm{Re}(\psi)$ and $\mathrm{Im}(\psi)$ to denote respectively the real and imaginary parts of ψ, and use also (a, Q, μ) to denote ψ. For $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$, we denote by P^x the law of $x + X$ under P. In particular, $P^0 = P$.

Denote by $\mathcal{B}^n$ the family of all nearly Borel sets of $\mathbf{R}^n$ (cf. [3, Definition I.10.21]). For $D \subset E$, we denote the first hitting time of D by

$$\sigma_D := \inf\{t > 0 : X_t \in D\}.$$

A set $D \subset E$ is called polar if there exists a set $C \in \mathcal{B}^n$ such that $D \subset C$ and $P^x(\sigma_C < \infty) = 0$ for every $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$. D is called a thin set if there exists a set $C \in \mathcal{B}^n$ such that $D \subset C$ and $P^x(\sigma_C = 0) = 0$ for every $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$. D is called semipolar if $D \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty D_n$ for some thin sets $\{D_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$. X is said to satisfy Hunt's hypothesis (H) if every semipolar set is polar.

To appreciate the importance of (H), we recall below some important principles of potential theory that are equivalent to (H). We refer the readers to [13, Proposition 1.1] for a summary of the proofs. For $\alpha > 0$, a finite α-excessive function f on $\mathbf{R}^n$ is called a regular potential provided that $E^x\{e^{-\alpha T_n} f(X_{T_n})\} \to E^x\{e^{-\alpha T} f(X_T)\}$ for $x \in E$ whenever $\{T_n\}$ is an increasing sequence of stopping times with limit T. Denote by $(U^\alpha)_{\alpha>0}$ the resolvent operators for X. For each $\alpha > 0$, (H) is equivalent to all of the following principles.

- **Bounded maximum principle:** If ν is a finite measure with compact support K such that $U^\alpha\nu$ is bounded, then $\sup\{U^\alpha\nu(x) : x \in E\} = \sup\{U^\alpha\nu(x) : x \in K\}$.
- **Bounded energy principle:** If ν is a finite measure with compact support such that $U^\alpha\nu$ is bounded, then ν does not charge semipolar sets.
- **Bounded regularity principle:** If ν is a finite measure with compact support such that $U^\alpha\nu$ is bounded, then $U^\alpha\nu$ is regular.

- **Bounded positivity principle:** If ν is a finite signed measure such that $U^\alpha\nu$ is bounded, then $\nu U^\alpha\nu \geq 0$, where $\nu U^\alpha\nu := \int_E U^\alpha\nu(x)\nu(dx)$.

Hunt's hypothesis (H) is also equivalent to some other important properties of Markov processes. For example, Blumenthal and Getoor [4, Proposition (4.1)] and Glover [7, Theorem (2.2)] showed that (H) holds if and only if the fine and cofine topologies differ by polar sets; Fitzsimmons and Kanda [5] showed that (H) is equivalent to the dichotomy of capacity.

In spite of its importance, Hunt's hypothesis (H) has been verified only in special situations. Blumenthal and Getoor [4] showed that all stable processes with index $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ on the line satisfy (H). Kanda [14] and Forst [6] proved independently that (H) holds if X has bounded continuous transition densities (with respect to the Lebesgue measure dx) and the Lévy-Khintchine exponent ψ satisfies

$$|\mathrm{Im}(\psi)| \leq M(1 + \mathrm{Re}(\psi)) \tag{1.1}$$

for some constant $M > 0$. Rao [16] gave a short proof of the Kanda-Forst theorem under the weaker condition that X has resolvent densities. In particular, for $n \geq 1$, all stable processes with index $\alpha \neq 1$ satisfy (H). Kanda [15] proved that (H) holds for stable processes on $\mathbf{R}^n$ with index $\alpha = 1$ if we assume that the linear term vanishes. Glover and Rao [8] proved that α-subordinates of general Hunt processes satisfy (H) (cf. Proposition 3.3 below). Rao [17] proved that if all 1-excessive functions of X are lower semicontinuous and

$$|\mathrm{Im}(\psi)| \leq (1 + \mathrm{Re}(\psi))f(1 + \mathrm{Re}(\psi)), \tag{1.2}$$

where f is an increasing function on $[1, \infty)$ such that $\int_N^\infty (\lambda f(\lambda))^{-1} d\lambda = \infty$ for every $N \geq 1$, then X satisfies (H).

In [11], we showed that i) if Q is non-degenerate, then X satisfies (H); ii) if Q is degenerate and $\mu(\mathbf{R}^n \backslash \sqrt{Q}\mathbf{R}^n) < \infty$, then X satisfies (H) if and only if the equation

$$\sqrt{Q}y = -a - \int_{\mathbf{R}^n \backslash \sqrt{Q}\mathbf{R}^n} x 1_{\{|x|<1\}} \mu(dx)$$

has at least one solution $y \in \mathbf{R}^n$. In [11], we also showed that if X is a subordinator satisfying (H) then its drift coefficient must be 0, i.e., X must be a pure jump subordinator. Recently, Hu, Sun and Zhang [13] gave a comparison result on Lévy processes which implies that big jumps have no effect on the validity of (H) in some sense. Moreover, Hu, Sun and Zhang obtained an extended Kanda-Forst-Rao theorem by virtue of a new necessary and sufficient condition for (H) (see [13, Theorems 4.3 and 4.5]).

In this paper, we will continue to explore Hunt's hypothesis (H) for Lévy processes. In the next section, we present two new necessary and sufficient conditions for (H), see Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 below. Applications of these new criteria for (H) will be given in Sections 3 and 4. In Section 3, we give explicit constructions

of Lévy processes satisfying (H) in a context where previously known results could not be applied. In Section 4, we prove an affirmative result concerning (H) for subordinators. We show that a large class of pure jump subordinators can be decomposed into the summation of two independent subordinators such that both of them satisfy (H).

2 New necessary and sufficient conditions for (H)

2.1 Statement of the main theorems

Let X be a Lévy process on $\mathbf{R}^n$ with Lévy-Khintchine exponent ψ. From now on till the end of this paper we assume that all 1-excessive functions are lower semicontinuous, equivalently, X has resolvent densities. We refer the readers to [10, Theorem 2.1] for more characterizations of this assumption.

Define

$$A := 1 + \mathrm{Re}(\psi), \quad B := |1 + \psi|. \tag{2.1}$$

For a finite (positive) measure ν on $\mathbf{R}^n$, we denote

$$\hat{\nu}(z) := \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} e^{i\langle z,x\rangle}\nu(dx).$$

ν is said to have finite 1-energy if

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz < \infty. \tag{2.2}$$

Let ν be a finite measure on $\mathbf{R}^n$ of finite 1-energy. For $\lambda > 0$, we define

$$c(\lambda) := \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2 + B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz.$$

Note that

$$c(\lambda) \le \lambda \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz < \infty. \tag{2.3}$$

By [17, Theorem 1 and the proof of Theorem 2], we have

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} c(\lambda) = \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2 + B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 1_{\{A(z)\le\lambda\}} dz < \infty. \tag{2.4}$$

The remarkable result of Rao ([17, Theorem 1]) essentially tells us that whether X satisfies (H) depends on if the limit in (2.4) equals 0. In fact, by virtue of [17, Theorem 1], we proved in [13] the following result.

Proposition 2.1. *([13, Theorem 5.1]) (H) holds if and only if*

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\int_{\mathbf{R}^n}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2(\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi(z))|\lambda+\psi(z)|^{-2}dz=0$$

for any finite measure ν of finite 1-energy.

Further, by Proposition 2.1 and [17, the proof of Theorem 2], we can obtain the following result.

Proposition 2.2. *(H) holds if and only if*

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\int_{\mathbf{R}^n}\frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2+B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz=0 \tag{2.5}$$

for any finite measure ν of finite 1-energy.

Let $\varsigma>1$ be a constant. We define

$$N_x^{\varsigma}:=\varsigma^{(\varsigma^x)}\ \text{ for } x\geq 0.$$

To simplify notations, we use N to denote N^{ς} whenever there is no confusion caused. Throughout this paper, we use log to denote $\log_e$.

Now we state the main theorems of this section.

Theorem 2.3. *(i) X satisfies (H) if the following condition holds:*

Condition $(C^{\log})$: For any finite measure ν on $\mathbf{R}^n$ of finite 1-energy, there exist a constant $\varsigma>1$ and a sequence $\{y_k\uparrow\infty\}$ such that $y_1>1$ and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{y_k\leq B(z)<(y_k)^{\varsigma}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz<\infty. \tag{2.6}$$

(ii) Suppose X satisfies (H). Then, for any finite measure ν on $\mathbf{R}^n$ of finite 1-energy and any $\varsigma>1$, there exists a sequence $\{y_k\uparrow\infty\}$ such that $y_1>1$ and (2.6) holds.

Theorem 2.4. *(i) X satisfies (H) if the following condition holds:*

Condition $(C^{\log\log})$: For any finite measure ν on $\mathbf{R}^n$ of finite 1-energy, there exist a constant $\varsigma>1$ and a sequence of positive numbers $\{x_k\}$ such that $N_{x_1}^{\varsigma}>e$, $x_k+1<x_{k+1}$, $k\in\mathbf{N}$, $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{x_k}=\infty$, and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{N_{x_k}^{\varsigma}\leq B(z)<N_{x_k+1}^{\varsigma}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))[\log\log(B(z))]}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz<\infty. \tag{2.7}$$

(ii) Suppose X satisfies (H). Then, for any finite measure ν on $\mathbf{R}^n$ of finite 1-energy and any $\varsigma>1$, there exists a sequence of positive numbers $\{x_k\}$ such that $N_{x_1}^{\varsigma}>e$, $x_k+1<x_{k+1}$, $k\in\mathbf{N}$, $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{x_k}=\infty$, and (2.7) holds.

2.2 Proof of Theorem 2.3

Before proving the main theorems, we first prove a lemma which has independent interest.

Lemma 2.5. *Let ν be a finite measure on $\mathbf{R}^n$ of finite 1-energy. Then, the following condition is fulfilled for any $\delta > 0$.*

$$\textit{Condition } (C^\delta): \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(2+B(z))[\log\log(2+B(z))]^{1+\delta}}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz < \infty. \quad (2.8)$$

Proof. We fix a $\delta > 0$ and let ν be an arbitrary finite measure on $\mathbf{R}^n$ of finite 1-energy. Denote

$$F := \{z \in \mathbf{R}^n : B(z) \geq 4A(z)\}.$$

Then, we obtain by the fact that $B(z) \geq 1$ and (2.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{R}^n \setminus F} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(2+B(z))[\log\log(2+B(z))]^{1+\delta}}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\ \leq\ & \frac{4}{\log 3(\log\log 3)^{1+\delta}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n \setminus F} \frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\ <\ & \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

By (2.9), to prove (2.8), it suffices to show that

$$\int_F \frac{1}{B(z)\log(2+B(z))[\log\log(2+B(z))]^{1+\delta}}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz < \infty.$$

Further, it suffices to show that

$$\int_F \frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))[\log\log(B(z))]^{1+\delta}}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz < \infty. \quad (2.10)$$

Set $N_k = 2^{(2^k)}$ for $k \geq 1$. Then, for each $k \geq 2$, we have

$$\log(N_{k-1}) \ =\ \log(N_k) - \log(N_{k-1}). \quad (2.11)$$

By the fact that $\log(2/\log 2) < 4(\log\log 4) = 4\log\log(N_1)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} k &= \log_2\log_2(N_{k-1})^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\log 2}\left(\log\log(N_{k-1}) + \log\left(\frac{2}{\log 2}\right)\right) \\ &< \frac{5}{\log 2}\log\log(N_{k-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

Define $f^\delta(\lambda) = 1$ when $1 \leq \lambda < 4$ and

$$f^\delta(\lambda) = k^{1+\delta}(\log(N_k) - \log(N_{k-1})), \ \text{ when } N_{k-1} \leq \lambda < N_k,\ k \geq 2.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_1^\infty \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda f^\delta(\lambda)} &= \int_1^4 \frac{1}{\lambda} d\lambda + \sum_{k=2}^\infty \int_{N_{k-1}}^{N_k} \frac{1}{k^{1+\delta}(\log(N_k) - \log(N_{k-1}))\lambda} d\lambda \\ &= \log 4 + \sum_{k=2}^\infty \frac{1}{k^{1+\delta}} \\ &< \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

By (2.3), (2.4), (2.13), Fubini's theorem, the definition of the function $f^\delta(\lambda)$, (2.11) and (2.12), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\infty &> \int_1^\infty \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda f^\delta(\lambda)} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2 + B^2(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 1_{\{A(z) \le \lambda\}} dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \int_{A(z)}^\infty \frac{d\lambda}{f^\delta(\lambda)(\lambda^2 + B^2(z))} \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \int_1^\infty \frac{A(z) d\eta}{f^\delta(A(z)\eta)(A^2(z)\eta^2 + B^2(z))} \qquad \text{(by letting } \lambda = A(z)\eta) \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \int_1^\infty \frac{(\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2 d\eta}{f^\delta(A(z)\eta)(\eta^2 + (\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2)} \\ &\ge \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \sum_{k=2}^\infty \int_{\{1 \vee \frac{N_{k-1}}{A(z)} \le \eta < \frac{N_k}{A(z)}\}} \frac{(\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2 d\eta}{k^{1+\delta}(\log(N_k) - \log(N_{k-1}))(\eta^2 + (\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2)} \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \sum_{k=2}^\infty \frac{1}{k^{1+\delta}(\log(N_k) - \log(N_{k-1}))} \int_{\{1 \vee \frac{N_{k-1}}{A(z)} \le \eta < \frac{N_k}{A(z)}\}} \frac{\frac{A(z)}{B(z)} d\eta}{1 + (\frac{A(z)}{B(z)}\eta)^2} \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \sum_{k=2}^\infty \frac{\arctan \frac{N_k}{B(z)} - \arctan \frac{N_{k-1} \vee A(z)}{B(z)}}{k^{1+\delta}(\log(N_k) - \log(N_{k-1}))} dz \\ &\ge \sum_{k_0=2}^\infty \int_{\{N_{k_0-1} \le B(z) < N_{k_0}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \sum_{k=2}^\infty \frac{\arctan \frac{N_k}{B(z)} - \arctan \frac{N_{k-1} \vee A(z)}{B(z)}}{k^{1+\delta}(\log(N_k) - \log(N_{k-1}))} dz \\ &\ge \sum_{k_0=2}^\infty \int_{\{z \in F:\, N_{k_0-1} \le B(z) < N_{k_0}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \frac{\arctan \frac{N_{k_0}}{B(z)} - \arctan(\frac{N_{k_0-1}}{B(z)} \vee \frac{1}{4})}{k_0^{1+\delta}(\log(N_{k_0}) - \log(N_{k_0-1}))} dz \\ &= \sum_{k_0=2}^\infty \left\{ \int_{\{z \in F:\, N_{k_0-1} \le B(z) < \frac{N_{k_0}}{2}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \frac{\arctan \frac{N_{k_0}}{B(z)} - \arctan(\frac{N_{k_0-1}}{B(z)} \vee \frac{1}{4})}{k_0^{1+\delta}(\log(N_{k_0}) - \log(N_{k_0-1}))} dz \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\{z \in F:\, \frac{N_{k_0}}{2} \le B(z) < N_{k_0}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \frac{\arctan \frac{N_{k_0}}{B(z)} - \arctan(\frac{N_{k_0-1}}{B(z)} \vee \frac{1}{4})}{k_0^{1+\delta}(\log(N_{k_0}) - \log(N_{k_0-1}))} dz \right\} \\ &\ge \sum_{k_0=2}^\infty \left\{ \int_{\{z \in F:\, N_{k_0-1} \le B(z) < \frac{N_{k_0}}{2}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \frac{\arctan 2 - \arctan 1}{k_0^{1+\delta}(\log(N_{k_0}) - \log(N_{k_0-1}))} dz \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\int_{\{z\in F:\,\frac{N_{k_0}}{2}\le B(z)<N_{k_0}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\frac{\arctan 1-\arctan\frac{1}{2}}{k_0^{1+\delta}(\log(N_{k_0})-\log(N_{k_0-1}))}dz\Bigg\}\\
\ge\ &\sum_{k_0=2}^{\infty}\int_{\{z\in F:\,N_{k_0-1}\le B(z)<N_{k_0}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\frac{\arctan 1-\arctan\frac{1}{2}}{k_0^{1+\delta}\log(N_{k_0-1})}dz\\
\ge\ &\sum_{k_0=2}^{\infty}\int_{\{z\in F:\,N_{k_0-1}\le B(z)<N_{k_0}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\frac{\arctan 1-\arctan\frac{1}{2}}{(\frac{5}{\log 2}\log\log(N_{k_0-1}))^{1+\delta}\log(N_{k_0-1})}dz\\
\ge\ &\frac{\arctan 1-\arctan\frac{1}{2}}{(5/\log 2)^{1+\delta}}\sum_{k_0=2}^{\infty}\int_{\{z\in F:\,N_{k_0-1}\le B(z)<N_{k_0}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))[\log\log(B(z))]^{1+\delta}}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz\\
=\ &\frac{\arctan 1-\arctan\frac{1}{2}}{(5/\log 2)^{1+\delta}}\int_F\frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))[\log\log(B(z))]^{1+\delta}}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, (2.10) holds and the proof is complete. □

Proof of Theorem 2.3.

(i) Suppose Condition ($C^{\log}$) holds. We will show that X satisfies (H). By Proposition 2.2, we need prove that (2.5) holds for any finite measure ν of finite 1-energy.

Let ν be a finite measure on $\mathbf{R}^n$ of finite 1-energy. By Condition ($C^{\log}$), there exist a constant $\varsigma>1$ and a sequence $\{y_k\uparrow\infty\}$ such that $y_1>1$ and (2.6) holds. We assume without loss of generality that $y_1>\varsigma$ and $(y_k)^{\varsigma}<y_{k+1}$ for $k\in\mathbf{N}$. Set

$$x_k=\log_{\varsigma}(\log_{\varsigma}y_k),\quad k\in\mathbf{N}.$$

For each $k\in\mathbf{N}$, we have

$$x_k+1=\log_{\varsigma}(\log_{\varsigma}(y_k)^{\varsigma})<\log_{\varsigma}(\log_{\varsigma}y_{k+1})=x_{k+1}. \tag{2.14}$$

Note that when $B(z)<N_{x_1}$ we have

$$\frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2+B^2(z)}\le\frac{1}{2B(z)}<\frac{N_{x_1}}{2}\frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)}. \tag{2.15}$$

By (2.2), (2.15) and the dominated convergence theorem, we get

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\int_{\{B(z)<N_{x_1}\}}\frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2+B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz=0.$$

Hence, to prove (2.5), it suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\int_{\{B(z)\ge N_{x_1}\}}\frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2+B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz=0. \tag{2.16}$$

For $\lambda > 1$, we define

$$g(\lambda) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1_{\{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}} \le \lambda < N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}\}}}{\log \lambda}.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{N_{x_1}}^{\infty} \frac{g(\lambda)}{\lambda} d\lambda &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}^{N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}} \frac{1}{\lambda \log \lambda} d\lambda \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\log\log(N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}) - \log\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\log\log(\varsigma^{(\varsigma^{x_k+\frac{3}{4}})}\right) - \log\log\left(\varsigma^{(\varsigma^{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\right)\Big) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4} \log \varsigma \\
&= \infty. \qquad (2.17)
\end{aligned}$$

By Fubini's theorem, the definition of the function $g(\lambda)$, and the inequality that $\frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan x \le \frac{1}{x}$ for $x > 0$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{N_{x_1}}^{\infty} \frac{g(\lambda)d\lambda}{\lambda} \int_{\{B(z)\ge N_{x_1}\}} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2 + B^2(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
= &\int_{\{B(z)\ge N_{x_1}\}} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \int_{N_{x_1}}^{\infty} \frac{g(\lambda)d\lambda}{\lambda^2 + B^2(z)} \\
= &\int_{\{B(z)\ge N_{x_1}\}} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \int_{\frac{N_{x_1}}{A(z)}}^{\infty} \frac{g(A(z)\eta)A(z)d\eta}{A^2(z)\eta^2 + B^2(z)} \qquad \text{(by letting } \lambda = A(z)\eta) \\
= &\int_{\{B(z)\ge N_{x_1}\}} \frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \int_{\frac{N_{x_1}}{A(z)}}^{\infty} \frac{g(A(z)\eta)(\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2 d\eta}{\eta^2 + (\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2} \\
\le &\int_{\{B(z)\ge N_{x_1}\}} \frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{\frac{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}{A(z)} \le \eta < \frac{N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}}{A(z)}\}} \frac{(\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2 d\eta}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})(\eta^2 + (\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2)} \\
= &\int_{\{B(z)\ge N_{x_1}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})} \int_{\{\frac{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}{A(z)} \le \eta < \frac{N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}}{A(z)}\}} \frac{\frac{A(z)}{B(z)} d\eta}{1 + (\frac{A(z)}{B(z)}\eta)^2} \\
= &\int_{\{B(z)\ge N_{x_1}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\arctan \frac{N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)} - \arctan \frac{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}{B(z)}}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})} dz \\
= &\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{N_{x_l} \le B(z) < N_{(x_l)+1}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\arctan \frac{N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)} - \arctan \frac{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}{B(z)}}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})} dz
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{N_{(x_l)+1}\le B(z)<N_{x_{(l+1)}}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{\arctan\frac{N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)}-\arctan\frac{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}{B(z)}}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}dz\\
=\;&\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{N_{x_l}\le B(z)<N_{(x_l)+1}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{l-1}\frac{\arctan\frac{N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)}-\arctan\frac{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}{B(z)}}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\right.\\
&\left.+\frac{\arctan\frac{N_{x_l+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)}-\arctan\frac{N_{x_l+\frac{1}{2}}}{B(z)}}{\log(N_{x_l+\frac{1}{2}})}+\sum_{k=l+1}^{\infty}\frac{\arctan\frac{N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)}-\arctan\frac{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}{B(z)}}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\right\}dz\\
&+\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{N_{(x_l)+1}\le B(z)<N_{x_{(l+1)}}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{l}\frac{\arctan\frac{N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)}-\arctan\frac{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}{B(z)}}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\right.\\
&\left.+\sum_{k=l+1}^{\infty}\frac{\arctan\frac{N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)}-\arctan\frac{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}{B(z)}}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\right\}dz\\
\le\;&\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{N_{x_l}\le B(z)<N_{(x_l)+1}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\left\{\frac{N_{x_{(l-1)}+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)}\sum_{k=1}^{l-1}\frac{1}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\right.\\
&\left.+\frac{\pi}{2\log(N_{x_l+\frac{1}{2}})}+\sum_{k=l+1}^{\infty}\frac{\frac{B(z)}{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\right\}dz\\
&+\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{N_{(x_l)+1}\le B(z)<N_{x_{(l+1)}}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\left\{\frac{N_{(x_l)+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)}\sum_{k=1}^{l}\frac{1}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\right.\\
&\left.+\sum_{k=l+1}^{\infty}\frac{\frac{B(z)}{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\right\}dz. \qquad (2.18)
\end{aligned}
$$

By (2.14), we get $x_k+\frac{1}{2}\ge(x_1+\frac{1}{2})+(k-1)$ for $k\ge1$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{l-1}\frac{1}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}&\le\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\\
&=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\log(\varsigma^{(\varsigma^{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})})}\\
&=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\varsigma^{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}\log\varsigma}\\
&=\frac{1}{\varsigma^{x_1+\frac{1}{2}}\log\varsigma}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\varsigma^{k-1}}\\
&=\frac{1}{\varsigma^{x_1+\frac{1}{2}}(\log\varsigma)(1-\frac{1}{\varsigma})}. \qquad (2.19)
\end{aligned}
$$

When $N_{x_l} \le B(z)$, we obtain by (2.14) and the definition of N_x that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{N_{x_{(l-1)}+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)} &\le \frac{N_{x_l-\frac{1}{4}}}{B(z)} \\ &= \frac{(N_{x_l})^{\varsigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}}}{B(z)} \\ &\le \frac{1}{(B(z))^{1-\varsigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

By (2.19) and (2.20), we obtain that when $N_{x_l} \le B(z)$,

$$\frac{N_{x_{(l-1)}+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)} \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} \frac{1}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})} \le \frac{1}{\varsigma^{x_1+\frac{1}{2}}(\log\varsigma)(1-\frac{1}{\varsigma})(B(z))^{1-\varsigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}}}. \tag{2.21}$$

When $N_{x_l} \le B(z) < N_{(x_l)+1}$, by the definition of N_x, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\pi}{2\log(N_{x_l+\frac{1}{2}})} &= \frac{\pi}{2\log(\varsigma^{(\varsigma^{x_l+\frac{1}{2}})})} \\ &= \frac{\pi}{2\varsigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\log(\varsigma^{(\varsigma^{(x_l)+1})})} \\ &= \frac{\pi}{2\varsigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\log(N_{(x_l)+1})} \\ &< \frac{\pi\varsigma^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2\log(B(z))}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

When $B(z) < N_{(x_l)+1}$, by (2.14), (2.19) and the definition of N_x, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=l+1}^{\infty} \frac{\frac{B(z)}{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})} &\le \frac{B(z)}{N_{x_{(l+1)}+\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})} \\ &\le \frac{B(z)}{N_{(x_l)+1+\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})} \\ &= \frac{B(z)}{(N_{(x_l)+1})^{\varsigma^{\frac{1}{2}}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\varsigma^{x_1+\frac{1}{2}}(\log\varsigma)(1-\frac{1}{\varsigma})} \\ &\le \frac{1}{\varsigma^{x_1+\frac{1}{2}}(\log\varsigma)(1-\frac{1}{\varsigma})(B(z))^{\varsigma^{\frac{1}{2}}-1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

Similar to (2.21) and (2.23), we can show that when $N_{(x_l)+1} \le B(z) < N_{x_{(l+1)}}$,

$$\frac{N_{(x_l)+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)} \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} \frac{1}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})} \le \frac{1}{\varsigma^{x_1+\frac{1}{2}}(\log\varsigma)(1-\frac{1}{\varsigma})(B(z))^{1-\varsigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}}}, \tag{2.24}$$

and

$$\sum_{k=l+1}^{\infty} \frac{\frac{B(z)}{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}}{\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})} \le \frac{1}{\varsigma^{x_1+\frac{1}{2}}(\log\varsigma)(1-\frac{1}{\varsigma})(B(z))^{\varsigma^{\frac{1}{2}}-1}}. \tag{2.25}$$

We fix a $\delta > 0$. Note that

$$\lim_{\eta\to\infty} \frac{\frac{1}{\eta^{1-\varsigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}}} + \frac{1}{\eta^{\varsigma^{\frac{1}{2}}-1}}}{\frac{1}{\log(2+\eta)[\log\log(2+\eta)]^{1+\delta}}} = 0,$$

and $N_{x_l} = y_l$, $N_{(x_l)+1} = (y_l)^{\varsigma}$ for $l \ge 1$. We obtain by (2.18), (2.21)-(2.25), (2.6) and Lemma 2.5 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{N_{x_1}}^{\infty} \frac{g(\lambda)d\lambda}{\lambda} \int_{\{B(z)\ge N_{x_1}\}} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2+B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
\le\ & \frac{1}{\varsigma^{x_1+\frac{1}{2}}(\log\varsigma)(1-\frac{1}{\varsigma})} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \left(\frac{1}{(B(z))^{1-\varsigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}}} + \frac{1}{(B(z))^{\varsigma^{\frac{1}{2}}-1}}\right) dz \\
&+\frac{\pi\varsigma^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{N_{x_l}\le B(z)<N_{(x_l)+1}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
\le\ & D_1 \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(2+B(z))[\log\log(2+B(z))]^{1+\delta}}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
&+\frac{\pi\varsigma^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{y_l\le B(z)<(y_l)^{\varsigma}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
<\ & \infty,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

where D_1 is a positive constant depending only on ς.

By (2.17) and (2.26), we obtain (2.16). Therefore, the proof of (i) is complete.

(ii) Suppose that X satisfies (H). Let ν be an arbitrary finite measure on $\mathbf{R}^n$ of finite 1-energy and $\varsigma > 1$ be a constant. By Proposition 2.2, $\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} c(\lambda) = 0$. We choose an increasing sequence of positive numbers $\{x_k\}$ such that

$$c(\lambda) \le \frac{1}{2^k}, \ \text{ if } \lambda \ge x_k. \tag{2.27}$$

We assume without loss of generality that $x_k + 1 < x_{k+1},\ k \in \mathbf{N}$. Set

$$y_k = N_{x_k} = \varsigma^{(\varsigma^{x_k})} \ \text{ for } k \in \mathbf{N}.$$

Denote

$$F := \{z \in \mathbf{R}^n : B(z) \ge 2A(z)\}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{z\in\mathbf{R}^n\setminus F:N_{x_k}\le B(z)<N_{x_k+1}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz\\
=\;&\int_{\{z\in\mathbf{R}^n\setminus F:N_{x_1}\le B(z)\}}\frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz\\
=\;&\int_{\{z\in\mathbf{R}^n\setminus F:N_{x_1}\le B(z)\}}\frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)}\cdot\frac{B(z)}{A(z)\log(B(z))}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz\\
\le\;&\frac{2}{\log(N_{x_1})}\int_{\mathbf{R}^n}\frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz\\
<\;&\infty,
\end{aligned}\tag{2.28}$$

to prove (2.6), it suffices to prove that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{z\in F:N_{x_k}\le B(z)<N_{x_k+1}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz<\infty.\tag{2.29}$$

For $\lambda>1$, we define $f(\lambda)=\log\lambda$. Set

$$\Lambda:=\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty}\{\lambda:N_{x_k}\le\lambda<N_{x_k+1}\}.$$

Then, by (2.27), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Lambda}\frac{c(\lambda)}{\lambda f(\lambda)}d\lambda\;&=\;\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\int_{N_{x_k}}^{N_{x_k+1}}\frac{c(\lambda)}{\lambda\log\lambda}d\lambda\\
&\le\;\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2^k}\int_{N_{x_k}}^{N_{x_k+1}}\frac{1}{\lambda\log\lambda}d\lambda\\
&=\;\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2^k}[\log\log(N_{x_k+1})-\log\log(N_{x_k})]\\
&=\;\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2^k}[\log\log(\varsigma^{(\varsigma^{x_k+1})})-\log\log(\varsigma^{(\varsigma^{x_k})})]\\
&=\;\log\varsigma\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2^k}\\
&<\;\infty.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.30}$$

For $k\ge1$, when $N_{x_k}\le B(z)<N_{x_k+1}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\log(N_{x_k+1})}\;=\;\frac{1}{\log(\varsigma^{(\varsigma^{x_k+1})})}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{\varsigma \log(\varsigma^{(\varsigma^{x_k})})} \\
&= \frac{1}{\varsigma \log(N_{x_k})} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\varsigma \log(B(z))}. \qquad (2.31)
\end{aligned}
$$

By (2.30), Fubini's theorem, (2.31), $N_{x_k} = y_k$ and $N_{(x_k)+1} = (y_k)^\varsigma$ for $k \geq 1$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\infty \;&>\; \int_\Lambda \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda f(\lambda)} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2 + B^2(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 1_{\{A(z) \leq \lambda\}} dz \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \int_{\Lambda \cap \{A(z) \leq \lambda\}} \frac{d\lambda}{f(\lambda)(\lambda^2 + B^2(z))} \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \int_{\frac{\Lambda}{A(z)} \cap \{1 \leq \eta\}} \frac{A(z) d\eta}{f(A(z)\eta)(A^2(z)\eta^2 + B^2(z))} \qquad \text{(by letting } \lambda = A(z)\eta) \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \int_{\frac{\Lambda}{A(z)} \cap \{1 \leq \eta\}} \frac{(\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2 d\eta}{f(A(z)\eta)(\eta^2 + (\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2)} \\
&\geq \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_{\{1 \vee \frac{N_{x_k}}{A(z)} \leq \eta < \frac{N_{x_k+1}}{A(z)}\}} \frac{(\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2 d\eta}{\log(N_{x_k+1})(\eta^2 + (\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2)} \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{1}{\log(N_{x_k+1})} \int_{\{1 \vee \frac{N_{x_k}}{A(z)} \leq \eta < \frac{N_{x_k+1}}{A(z)}\}} \frac{\frac{A(z)}{B(z)} d\eta}{1 + (\frac{A(z)}{B(z)}\eta)^2} \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\arctan \frac{N_{x_k+1}}{B(z)} - \arctan \frac{N_{x_k} \vee A(z)}{B(z)}}{\log(N_{x_k+1})} dz \\
&\geq \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_{\{z \in F:\, N_{x_k} \leq B(z) < N_{x_k+1}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \frac{\arctan \frac{N_{x_k+1}}{B(z)} - \arctan(\frac{N_{x_k}}{B(z)} \vee \frac{1}{2})}{\log(N_{x_k+1})} dz \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^\infty \left\{ \int_{\{z \in F:\, N_{x_k} \leq B(z) < \frac{N_{x_k+1}}{2}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \frac{\arctan \frac{N_{x_k+1}}{B(z)} - \arctan(\frac{N_{x_k}}{B(z)} \vee \frac{1}{2})}{\log(N_{x_k+1})} dz \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{\{z \in F:\, \frac{N_{x_k+1}}{2} \leq B(z) < N_{x_k+1}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \frac{\arctan \frac{N_{x_k+1}}{B(z)} - \arctan(\frac{N_{x_k}}{B(z)} \vee \frac{1}{2})}{\log(N_{x_k+1})} dz \right\} \\
&\geq \sum_{k=1}^\infty \left\{ \int_{\{z \in F:\, N_{x_k} \leq B(z) < \frac{N_{x_k+1}}{2}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \frac{\arctan 2 - \arctan 1}{\log(N_{x_k+1})}\, dz \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{\{z \in F:\, \frac{N_{x_k+1}}{2} \leq B(z) < N_{x_k+1}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \frac{\arctan 1 - \arctan \frac{1}{2}}{\log(N_{x_k+1})} dz \right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{z\in F:\, N_{x_k}\leq B(z)<N_{x_k+1}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \frac{\arctan 1-\arctan\frac{1}{2}}{\log(N_{x_k+1})}dz$$
$$\geq \frac{\arctan 1-\arctan\frac{1}{2}}{\varsigma} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{z\in F:\, y_k\leq B(z)<(y_k)^{\varsigma}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz.$$

Therefore, (2.29) holds and the proof of (ii) is complete. □

2.3 Proof of Theorem 2.4

The proof of Theorem 2.4 is similar to that of Theorem 2.3 but is more delicate. In the proof below, we will concentrate on the differences.

(i) Let ν be an arbitrary finite measure on $\mathbf{R}^n$ of finite 1-energy. We choose a constant ς and a sequence $\{x_k\}$ described as in Condition ($C^{\log\log}$). We assume without loss of generality that $x_1 > 2$. We will show that (2.16) holds.

For $\lambda > 1$, we define

$$g(\lambda) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1_{\{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}\leq\lambda<N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}\}}}{x_k\log\lambda}.$$

Similar to (2.17), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{N_{x_1}}^{\infty} \frac{g(\lambda)}{\lambda}d\lambda &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{x_k}\int_{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}^{N_{x_k+\frac{3}{4}}} \frac{1}{\lambda\log\lambda}d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{4}\log\varsigma\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{x_k} \\ &= \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

Further, similar to (2.18), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{N_{x_1}}^{\infty} \frac{g(\lambda)d\lambda}{\lambda}\int_{\{B(z)\geq N_{x_1}\}} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2+B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz \\ \leq\ &\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{N_{x_l}\leq B(z)<N_{(x_l)+1}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\left\{\frac{N_{x_{(l-1)}+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)}\sum_{k=1}^{l-1}\frac{1}{x_k\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\right. \\ &\quad \left.+\frac{\pi}{2x_l\log(N_{x_l+\frac{1}{2}})}+\sum_{k=l+1}^{\infty}\frac{\frac{B(z)}{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}}{x_k\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\right\}dz \\ &+\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{N_{(x_l)+1}\leq B(z)<N_{x_{(l+1)}}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\left\{\frac{N_{(x_l)+\frac{3}{4}}}{B(z)}\sum_{k=1}^{l}\frac{1}{x_k\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\right. \\ &\quad \left.+\sum_{k=l+1}^{\infty}\frac{\frac{B(z)}{N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}}}}{x_k\log(N_{x_k+\frac{1}{2}})}\right\}dz. \end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

When $N_{x_l} \le B(z) < N_{(x_l)+1}$, by the definition of N_x and the assumption that $x_1 > 2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\log\log(B(z))} &> \frac{1}{\log\log(N_{(x_l)+1})} \\
&= \frac{1}{\log\log(\varsigma^{(\varsigma^{(x_l)+1})})} \\
&= \frac{1}{(x_l+1)\log\varsigma + \log\log\varsigma} \\
&> \frac{1}{(x_l+2)\log\varsigma} \\
&> \frac{1}{2(\log\varsigma)x_l}. \qquad (2.34)
\end{aligned}$$

We fix a $\delta > 0$. Then, we obtain by (2.33), (2.34), (2.19)-(2.25), the fact that $x_k > 2$ for $k \ge 1$, (2.7) and Lemma 2.5 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{N_{x_1}}^{\infty} \frac{g(\lambda)d\lambda}{\lambda} \int_{\{B(z)\ge N_{x_1}\}} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2 + B^2(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
\le\ & \frac{1}{2\varsigma^{x_1+\frac{1}{2}}(\log\varsigma)(1-\frac{1}{\varsigma})} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{1}{B(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 \left(\frac{1}{(B(z))^{1-\varsigma^{-\frac{1}{4}}}} + \frac{1}{(B(z))^{\varsigma^{\frac{1}{2}}-1}} \right) dz \\
&+\pi(\log\varsigma)\varsigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{N_{x_l}\le B(z)<N_{(x_l)+1}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))[\log\log(B(z))]} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
\le\ & D_1 \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(2+B(z))[\log\log(2+B(z))]^{1+\delta}} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
&+\pi(\log\varsigma)\varsigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{y_l\le B(z)<(y_l)^{\varsigma}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))[\log\log(B(z))]} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
<\ & \infty, \qquad (2.35)
\end{aligned}$$

where D_1 is a positive constant depending only on ς.

By (2.32) and (2.35), we obtain (2.16). Therefore, the proof of (i) is complete.

(ii) Suppose that X satisfies (H). Let ν be an arbitrary finite measure on $\mathbf{R}^n$ of finite 1-energy and $\varsigma > 1$ be a constant. We choose a sequence of increasing natural numbers $\{p_k\}$ satisfying

$$c(\lambda) \le \frac{1}{2^k}, \quad \text{if } \lambda \ge p_k. \qquad (2.36)$$

For $m = 1, 2 \ldots$, we set $x_{m,1} = p_m + 2$ and choose k_m such that

$$1 \le \frac{1}{p_m+2} + \frac{1}{p_m+4} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_m+2k_m} \le 2. \qquad (2.37)$$

Define $x_{m,l_m} = p_m + 2l_m$ for $1 \le l_m \le k_m$. We require without loss of generality that

$$x_{1,1} > 1 - \frac{2\log\log\varsigma}{\log\varsigma}, \tag{2.38}$$

and

$$N^{\varsigma}_{x_{1,1}} > e \ \text{ and } \ x_{m,k_m} < p_{m+1}, \quad m = 1, 2, \ldots$$

Denote

$$F := \{z \in \mathbf{R}^n : B(z) \ge 2A(z)\}.$$

We will show below that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\sum_{l_m=1}^{k_m}\int_{\{z\in F: N_{x_{m,l_m}} \le B(z) < N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}\}} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))[\log\log(B(z))]}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz < \infty.$$

We define

$$f(\lambda) = k(\log(N_k) - \log(N_{k-1})), \quad \text{when } N_{k-1} \le \lambda < N_k, \ k \ge 2.$$

Set

$$\Lambda := \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty}\bigcup_{l_m=1}^{k_m}\{\lambda : N_{x_{m,l_m}} \le \lambda < N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}\}.$$

Similar to (2.30), we can show that

$$\int_{\Lambda}\frac{c(\lambda)}{\lambda f(\lambda)}d\lambda < \infty.$$

Further, we obtain by (2.36) and (2.37) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\infty &> \int_{\Lambda}\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda f(\lambda)}\int_{\mathbf{R}^n}\frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2 + B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 1_{\{A(z)\le\lambda\}}dz \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \int_{\Lambda\cap\{A(z)\le\lambda\}}\frac{d\lambda}{f(\lambda)(\lambda^2 + B^2(z))} \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \int_{\frac{\Lambda}{A(z)}\cap\{1\le\eta\}}\frac{A(z)d\eta}{f(A(z)\eta)(A^2(z)\eta^2 + B^2(z))} \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n}\frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \int_{\frac{\Lambda}{A(z)}\cap\{1\le\eta\}}\frac{(\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2 d\eta}{f(A(z)\eta)(\eta^2 + (\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2)} \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n}\frac{A(z)}{B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\sum_{l_m=1}^{k_m}\int_{\{1\vee\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}}}{A(z)}\le\eta<\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}}{A(z)}\}} \\
&\qquad \cdot\frac{(\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2 d\eta}{(x_{m,l_m}+1)(\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}) - \log(N_{x_{m,l_m}}))(\eta^2 + (\frac{B(z)}{A(z)})^2)} \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\sum_{l_m=1}^{k_m}\frac{\arctan\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}}{B(z)} - \arctan\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}}\vee A(z)}{B(z)}}{(x_{m,l_m}+1)(\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}) - \log(N_{x_{m,l_m}}))}
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\geq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\sum_{l_m=1}^{k_m}\int_{\{z\in F:\, N_{x_{m,l_m}}\leq B(z)<N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\\
&\qquad\cdot\frac{\arctan\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}}{B(z)}-\arctan\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}}}{B(z)}\vee\frac{1}{2})}{(x_{m,l_m}+1)(\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}+1})-\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}}))}dz\\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\sum_{l_m=1}^{k_m}\left\{\int_{\{z\in F:\, N_{x_{m,l_m}}\leq B(z)<\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}}{2}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\right.\\
&\qquad\cdot\frac{\arctan\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}}{B(z)}-\arctan(\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}}}{B(z)}\vee\frac{1}{2})}{(x_{m,l_m}+1)(\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}+1})-\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}}))}dz\\
&\quad+\int_{\{z\in F:\,\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}}{2}\leq B(z)<N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\\
&\qquad\left.\cdot\frac{\arctan\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}}{B(z)}-\arctan(\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}}}{B(z)}\vee\frac{1}{2})}{(x_{m,l_m}+1)(\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}+1})-\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}}))}dz\right\}\\
&\geq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\sum_{l_m=1}^{k_m}\left\{\int_{\{z\in F:\, N_{x_{m,l_m}}\leq B(z)<\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}}{2}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\right.\\
&\qquad\cdot\frac{\arctan 2-\arctan 1}{(x_{m,l_m}+1)(\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}+1})-\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}}))}dz\\
&\quad+\int_{\{z\in F:\,\frac{N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}}{2}\leq B(z)<N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\\
&\qquad\left.\cdot\frac{\arctan 1-\arctan\frac{1}{2}}{(x_{m,l_m}+1)(\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}+1})-\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}}))}dz\right\}\\
&\geq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\sum_{l_m=1}^{k_m}\int_{\{z\in F:\, N_{x_{m,l_m}}\leq B(z)<N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2\\
&\qquad\cdot\frac{\arctan 1-\arctan\frac{1}{2}}{(x_{m,l_m}+1)(\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}+1})-\log(N_{x_{m,l_m}}))}dz\\
&\geq \frac{(\log\varsigma)(\arctan 1-\arctan\frac{1}{2})}{2\varsigma}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\sum_{l_m=1}^{k_m}\int_{\{z\in F:\, N_{x_{m,l_m}}\leq B(z)<N_{x_{m,l_m}+1}\}}\\
&\qquad\cdot\frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))[\log\log(B(z))]}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz, \qquad (2.39)
\end{aligned}
$$

where (2.38) has been used to obtain the last inequality.

Set $\{x_k\}=\{x_{m,l_m}: 1\leq l_m\leq k_m\}$. Then, we obtain by (2.39) that

$$
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{z\in F:\, N_{x_k}\leq B(z)<N_{x_k+1}\}}\frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))[\log\log(B(z))]}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz<\infty.
$$

Therefore, the proof of (ii) is complete by (2.28). □

3 New examples of Lévy processes satisfying (H)

As applications of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4, we will present in this section some new examples of Lévy processes satisfying Hunt's hypothesis (H).

3.1 Application of Theorem 2.3

Theorem 2.3 provides a new necessary and sufficient condition for the validity of (H) for Lévy processes. Different from the classical Kanda-Forst condition (1.1) and Rao's condition (1.2), our Condition ($C^{\log}$) only requires that $\mathrm{Im}(\psi)$ is partially well-controlled by $1 + \mathrm{Re}(\psi)$. This weaker condition is fulfilled by more general Lévy processes and reveals the more essential reason for the validity of (H).

First, we give the following consequence of Theorem 2.3.

Proposition 3.1. *X satisfies (H) if the following conditions hold:*

(i) $\frac{1}{c}|z|^\alpha \le A(z) \le B(z) \le c|z|^\beta$ for $|z| \ge 1$, where $0 < \alpha < \beta \le 2$ and $c > 1$ are constants.

(ii) There exist $\varsigma > 1$, $\kappa > 0$, and a sequence $\{z_k\}$ such that $z_1 > 1$, $c^{\frac{\varsigma+1}{\alpha}} z_k^{\frac{\varsigma\beta}{\alpha}} < z_{k+1}$, $k \in \mathbf{N}$, and

$$B(z) \le \kappa A(z) \log(B(z)), \quad \text{for } z_k \le |z| < c^{\frac{\varsigma+1}{\alpha}} z_k^{\frac{\varsigma\beta}{\alpha}},\ k \in \mathbf{N}.$$

Proof. Suppose that conditions (i) and (ii) hold. By (i) and Hartman and Wintner [9], we know that X has bounded continuous transition densities.

Let ν be a finite measure on $\mathbf{R}^n$ of finite 1-energy. Set

$$y_k = c z_k^\beta, \quad k \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{3.40}$$

Then, $y_1 > c > 1$ and

$$z_{k+1} > c z_k^\varsigma > c z_k, \quad k \in \mathbf{N}.$$

Hence $z_k \uparrow \infty$ and thus $y_k \uparrow \infty$ as $k \to \infty$.

By (i) and (3.40), we find that when $y_k \le B(z) < (y_k)^\varsigma$,

$$z_k \le |z| < c^{\frac{\varsigma+1}{\alpha}} z_k^{\frac{\varsigma\beta}{\alpha}}. \tag{3.41}$$

Then, we obtain by (3.41), $y_1 > c$, conditions (i) and (ii) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{y_k \le B(z) < (y_k)^\varsigma\}} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\ = & \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{y_k \le B(z) < (y_k)^\varsigma, |z| \ge 1\}} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{y_k\le B(z)<(y_k)^{\varsigma},|z|<1\}}\frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz\\
\le\ &\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\int_{\{z_k\le|z|<c^{\frac{\varsigma+1}{\alpha}}z_k^{\frac{\varsigma\beta}{\alpha}}\}}\frac{\kappa A(z)}{B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz+\int_{\{z:\,|z|<1,\,B(z)\ge c\}}\frac{1}{B(z)\log(B(z))}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz\\
\le\ &\int_{\mathbf{R}^n}\frac{\kappa A(z)}{B^2(z)}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2dz+\frac{(\nu(\mathbf{R}^n))^2}{c\log c}\int_{\{|z|<1\}}dz\\
<\ &\infty.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, Condition ($C^{\log}$) holds and the proof is complete by Theorem 2.3(i). □

Remark 3.2. *Blumenthal and Getoor introduced in [2] different indices for Lévy processes on* $\mathbf{R}^n$*. In particular, they defined*

$$\beta=\inf\left\{\alpha\ge 0:\frac{|\psi(z)|}{|z|^{\alpha}}\to 0\text{ as }|z|\to\infty\right\},$$

and

$$\beta''=\sup\left\{\alpha\ge 0:\frac{\mathrm{Re}\psi(z)}{|z|^{\alpha}}\to\infty\text{ as }|z|\to\infty\right\}.$$

Proposition 3.1 provides a sufficient condition for the validity of (H) in the case that $\beta''<\beta$*.*

Note that in condition (ii) of Proposition 3.1, z_{k+1} *can be chosen to be much bigger than* z_k *for each* $k\in\mathbf{N}$*. Hence Proposition 3.1 can be used to construct a class of Lévy processes with indices* $\beta''<\beta$ *and satisfying (H). As a concrete example, we will give in Example 3.4 below a class of subordinators satisfying (H). Recall that by virtue of the following remarkable result of Glover and Rao, whenever we find a new class of subordinators satisfying (H), we obtain a new class of time-changed Markov processes satisfying (H).*

Proposition 3.3. *(Glover and Rao [8]) Let* $(X_t)_{t\ge0}$ *be a standard Markov process on a locally compact space with a countable base and* $(T_t)_{t\ge0}$ *be an independent subordinator satisfying Hunt's hypothesis (H). Then* $(X_{T_t})_{t\ge0}$ *satisfies (H).*

Example 3.4. *Let* $0<\alpha<\beta<1$*,* $c_1>1$*,* $\varsigma>1$ *and* $0<\kappa_1\le c_1$*. Denote*

$$c:=c_1\left(8+\frac{1}{1-\beta}+\frac{2}{\beta}\right).$$

We choose a sequence $\{z_k\}$ *satisfying* $z_1>1$*,* $c^{\frac{\varsigma+1}{\alpha}}z_k^{\frac{\varsigma\beta}{\alpha}}<z_{k+1}$*,* $k\in\mathbf{N}$*.*

Let X *be a pure jump subordinator with Lévy measure* $\mu(dx):=\rho(x)dx$*. Suppose* ρ *satisfies the following conditions:*

(i) $\frac{1}{c_1x^{1+\alpha}}\le\rho(x)\le\frac{c_1}{x^{1+\beta}}$ *for* $0<x\le1$*; and* $\rho(x)=0$*, otherwise.*

(ii) $\rho(x)\ge\frac{\kappa_1}{x^{1+\beta}}$ *for* $\frac{1}{2c^{\frac{\varsigma+1}{\alpha}}z_k^{\frac{\varsigma\beta}{\alpha}}}\le x<\frac{1}{z_k}$*,* $k\in\mathbf{N}$*.*

Then X satisfies (H).

In fact, for $z \in \mathbf{R}$ with $|z| \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A(z) &= 1 + \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(zx))\rho(x)dx \\ &\geq \int_0^{\frac{1}{|z|}} (1 - \cos(zx))\frac{1}{c_1 x^{1+\alpha}}dx \\ &\geq \int_0^{\frac{1}{|z|}} \frac{|z|^2 x^2}{4c_1 x^{1+\alpha}}dx \\ &= \frac{1}{4c_1(2-\alpha)}|z|^\alpha \\ &> \frac{1}{8c_1}|z|^\alpha \\ &> \frac{1}{c}|z|^\alpha, \end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B(z) &= |1 + \psi(z)| \\ &\leq 1 + \mathrm{Re}\psi(z) + |\mathrm{Im}\psi(z)| \\ &= 1 + \int_0^1 (1 - \cos(zx))\rho(x)dx + \left|\int_0^1 \sin(zx)\rho(x)dx\right| \\ &\leq 1 + \int_0^1 (1 - \cos(zx))\frac{c_1}{x^{1+\beta}}dx + \int_0^1 |\sin(zx)|\frac{c_1}{x^{1+\beta}}dx \\ &\leq 1 + \int_0^{\frac{1}{|z|}} \left(\frac{|z|^2x^2}{2} + |z|x\right)\frac{c_1}{x^{1+\beta}}dx + 2\int_{\frac{1}{|z|}}^1 \frac{c_1}{x^{1+\beta}}dx \\ &= 1 + \frac{c_1}{2(2-\beta)}|z|^\beta + \frac{c_1}{1-\beta}|z|^\beta + \frac{2c_1}{\beta}(|z|^\beta - 1) \\ &= c_1\left(\frac{1}{2(2-\beta)} + \frac{1}{1-\beta} + \frac{2}{\beta}\right)|z|^\beta + \left(1 - \frac{2c_1}{\beta}\right) \\ &< c|z|^\beta. \end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

For $z_k \leq |z| < c^{\frac{\varsigma+1}{\alpha}} z_k^{\frac{\varsigma\beta}{\alpha}}$, $k \in \mathbf{N}$, by condition (ii) and (3.43), we get

$$\begin{aligned} A(z) &\geq \int_{\frac{1}{2|z|}}^{\frac{1}{|z|}} (1 - \cos(zx))\frac{\kappa_1}{x^{1+\beta}}dx \\ &\geq \int_{\frac{1}{2|z|}}^{\frac{1}{|z|}} \frac{\kappa_1|z|^2x^2}{4x^{1+\beta}}dx \\ &= \frac{\kappa_1}{4(2-\beta)}\left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{2-\beta}}\right)|z|^\beta \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \frac{\kappa_1}{16}|z|^\beta \\ &\geq \frac{\kappa_1}{16c}B(z). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.42) and Hartman and Wintner [9], X has bounded continuous transition densities. Hence conditions (i) and (ii) of Proposition 3.1 are fulfilled and therefore X satisfies (H).

3.2 Application of Theorem 2.4

We define

Condition (C^0) : For any finite measure ν on $\mathbf{R}^n$ of finite 1-energy,
$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(2+B(z))[\log\log(2+B(z))]}|\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz < \infty,$$

and

Condition ($\mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{B/A}}$) : There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that
$$B(z) \leq CA(z)\log(2+B(z))[\log\log(2+B(z))], \quad \forall z \in \mathbf{R}^n.$$

As a direct consequence of Theorem 2.4, we obtain the following new sufficient conditions for the validity of Hunt's hypothesis (H).

Proposition 3.5. *Condition ($C^{B/A}$) $\Rightarrow$ Condition (C^0) $\Rightarrow$ (H).*

By Proposition 3.5, we get the following result.

Corollary 3.6. *Let X be a Lévy process on $\mathbf{R}$. Suppose that*
$$\liminf_{|z|\to\infty} \frac{|\psi(z)|}{|z|(\log\log|z|)^\delta} > 0 \tag{3.44}$$
for some constant $\delta > 0$. Then X satisfies (H).

Proof. By (3.44), there exist constants $K > e$ and $\kappa > 0$ such that
$$\frac{|\psi(z)|}{|z|(\log\log|z|)^\delta} \geq \kappa, \quad \text{if } |z| \geq K.$$
Hence, when $|z| \geq K$, we have
$$B(z) = |1+\psi(z)| \geq |\psi(z)| \geq \kappa|z|(\log\log|z|)^\delta.$$

Define $G = \max\{K, e^e, \frac{2e}{\kappa}\}$ and
$$C_1 = \int_{|z|<G} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(2+B(z))[\log\log(2+B(z))]}dz.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(2+B(z))[\log\log(2+B(z))]}dz \\
&= C_1 + \int_{|z|\geq G} \frac{1}{B(z)\log(2+B(z))[\log\log(2+B(z))]}dz \\
&\leq C_1 + \int_{|z|\geq G} \frac{1}{\kappa|z|(\log\log|z|)^\delta \log(2+\kappa|z|(\log\log|z|)^\delta)[\log\log(2+\kappa|z|(\log\log|z|)^\delta)]}dz \\
&\leq C_1 + \int_{|z|\geq G} \frac{1}{\kappa|z|(\log\log|z|)^\delta \log(\kappa|z|)[\log\log(\kappa|z|)]}dz \\
&\leq C_1 + C_2 \int_{|z|\geq G} \frac{1}{|z|\log|z|(\log\log|z|)^{1+\delta}}dz \\
&< \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where C_2 is a positive constant depending on K and κ. Therefore, Condition (C^0) holds and the proof is complete by Proposition 3.5. □

Example 3.7. *Let X be a Lévy process on $\mathbf{R}$ with Lévy-Khintchine exponent (a, Q, μ). Suppose that there exist constants $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that*

$$d\mu \geq \frac{c[\log(-\log|x|)]^\delta}{x^2}dx \quad on \quad \left\{x \in \mathbf{R} : 0 < |x| < \frac{1}{e}\right\}.$$

Then X satisfies (H).

In fact, for $|z| \geq e$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Re}\psi(z) &= \frac{1}{2}Qz^2 + \int_{\mathbf{R}} (1-\cos(zx))\mu(dx) \\
&\geq \int_{\{|x|<\frac{1}{e}\}} (1-\cos(zx))\frac{c[\log(-\log|x|)]^\delta}{x^2}dx \\
&\geq 2\int_0^{\frac{1}{|z|}} (1-\cos(zx))\frac{c[\log(-\log|x|)]^\delta}{x^2}dx \\
&\geq 2\int_0^{\frac{1}{|z|}} \frac{|z|^2x^2}{2}\cdot\frac{c[\log(-\log|x|)]^\delta}{x^2}dx \\
&= c|z|^2\int_0^{\frac{1}{|z|}} [\log(-\log|x|)]^\delta dx \\
&\geq c|z|^2\int_0^{\frac{1}{|z|}} (\log\log|z|)^\delta dx \\
&= c|z|(\log\log|z|)^\delta,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (3.44). Therefore, X satisfies (H) by Corollary 3.6. Note that in this example it does not matter if a or Q equals 0.

Remark 3.8. *Corollary 3.6 and Example 3.7 extend the corresponding results of [13, Proposition 4.10 and Example 4.8].*

4 Decomposition of subordinator into two independent ones satisfying (H)

In [11], we proved that if a subordinator satisfies (H) then it must be a pure jump subordinator. To date, it is still unknown if all pure jump subordinators satisfy (H). We refer the interested readers to [13] for some known examples of subordinators satisfying (H).

Definition 4.1. *Let $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$. A pure jump subordinator X is said to be of type-(α, β) if the Lévy measure of X has density, which is denoted by ρ, and there exists a constant $c > 1$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{cx^{1+\alpha}} \leq \rho(x) \leq \frac{c}{x^{1+\beta}}, \quad \forall x \in (0, 1]. \tag{4.45}$$

In this section, we will apply Theorem 2.3 to prove the following result.

Theorem 4.2. *Any pure jump subordinator of type-(α, β) can be decomposed into the summation of two independent pure jump subordinators of type-(α, β) such that both of them satisfy (H).*

Proof. We fix $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$. Let X be a pure jump subordinator of type-(α, β) such that its Lévy density ρ satisfies (4.45). By [13, Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.2], big jumps have no effect on the validity of (H). So we can assume without loss of generality that $\rho(x) = 0$ for $x \in (1, \infty)$.

For $i = 1, 2$, we set

$$\rho^i(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2cx^{1+\alpha}} + \rho_i(x), & \text{if } x \in (0, 1], \\ 0, & \text{if } x \in (1, \infty), \end{cases} \tag{4.46}$$

where ρ_1 and ρ_2 are two non-negative functions defined on $(0, 1]$ satisfying

$$\rho_1(x) + \rho_2(x) = \rho(x) - \frac{1}{cx^{1+\alpha}}, \quad \forall x \in (0, 1],$$

and thus

$$\rho^1(x) + \rho^2(x) = \rho(x), \quad \forall x \in (0, \infty). \tag{4.47}$$

We will suitably define ρ_1, ρ_2 below to ensure that the pure jump subordinators X^1 and X^2 with Lévy densities ρ^1 and ρ^2, respectively, satisfy the requirements of the desired decomposition. Note that by (4.45)-(4.47), for $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2cx^{1+\alpha}} \leq \rho^i(x) \leq \frac{c}{x^{1+\beta}}, \quad \forall x \in (0, 1]. \tag{4.48}$$

For $i = 1, 2$, we use ψ_{X^i} to denote the Lévy-Khintchine exponent of X_i and use A_{X^i}, B_{X^i}, etc. to denote the corresponding quantities of X^i (cf. (2.1)). For $z \in \mathbf{R}$ with $|z| \geq 1$, by (4.48), $c > 1$ and $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{X^i}(z) &= 1 + \mathrm{Re}\psi_{X^i}(z) \\ &= 1 + \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(zx))\rho_i(x)dx \\ &\geq 1 + \int_0^1 (1 - \cos(zx))\frac{1}{2cx^{1+\alpha}}dx \\ &\geq 1 + \int_0^{\frac{1}{|z|}} (1 - \cos(zx))\frac{1}{2cx^{1+\alpha}}dx \\ &\geq 1 + \int_0^{\frac{1}{|z|}} \frac{|z|^2x^2}{8cx^{1+\alpha}}dx \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{8c(2-\alpha)}|z|^\alpha \\ &> 1 + \frac{1}{16c}|z|^\alpha, \end{aligned} \tag{4.49}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B_{X^i}(z) &= |1 + \psi_{X^i}(z)| \\ &\leq 1 + \int_0^1 (1 - \cos(zx))\rho_i(x)dx + \left|\int_0^1 \sin(zx)\rho_i(x)dx\right| \\ &\leq 1 + \int_0^1 (1 - \cos(zx))\frac{c}{x^{1+\beta}}dx + \int_0^1 |\sin(zx)|\frac{c}{x^{1+\beta}}dx \\ &\leq 1 + \int_0^{\frac{1}{|z|}} \left(\frac{|z|^2x^2}{2} + |z|x\right)\frac{c}{x^{1+\beta}}dx + 2\int_{\frac{1}{|z|}}^1 \frac{c}{x^{1+\beta}}dx \\ &= 1 + \frac{c}{2(2-\beta)}|z|^\beta + \frac{c}{1-\beta}|z|^\beta + \frac{2c}{\beta}(|z|^\beta - 1) \\ &= c\left(\frac{1}{2(2-\beta)} + \frac{1}{1-\beta} + \frac{2}{\beta}\right)|z|^\beta + \left(1 - \frac{2c}{\beta}\right) \\ &< c\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1-\beta} + \frac{2}{\beta}\right)|z|^\beta. \end{aligned} \tag{4.50}$$

Fix a constant $\varsigma > 1$ and set $\varepsilon_0 = 1$, $\varepsilon_1 = 1/2$, $\rho_1(x) = \rho(x) - \frac{1}{cx^{1+\alpha}}$, $\rho_2(x) = 0$ for $x \in (\varepsilon_1, 1]$. We will define $\varepsilon_n, \rho_1(x), \rho_2(x)$, $x \in (\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon_{n-1}]$ by induction. Suppose that $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n, \rho_1(x), \rho_2(x), x \in (\varepsilon_n, 1], n \geq 1$, have been defined. In the following, we will define $\varepsilon_{n+1}, \rho_1(x), \rho_2(x), x \in (\varepsilon_{n+1}, \varepsilon_n]$.

First, we consider the case that n is an odd number. Define $d\mu^{(n)} = (\rho_1(x)1_{(\varepsilon_n,1]}(x))dx$. By the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma,

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \sin(zx)\mu^{(n)}(dx) = 0.$$

Hence there exists a positive constant, which is denoted by z_{n+1}, such that

$$\left|\int_{\mathbf{R}} \sin(zx)\mu^{(n)}(dx)\right| \le 1, \quad \text{for } |z| \ge z_{n+1}. \tag{4.51}$$

We assume without loss of generality that

$$z_{n+1} > \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n}. \tag{4.52}$$

Define

$$c_1 := c\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1-\beta} + \frac{2}{\beta}\right), \tag{4.53}$$

$$z'_{n+1} := \left[16c(c_1 z_{n+1}^{\beta})^{\zeta}\right]^{1/\alpha}, \tag{4.54}$$

$$\varepsilon_{n+1} := 1/(z'_{n+1})^{1/(1-\beta)}. \tag{4.55}$$

For any $x \in (\varepsilon_{n+1}, \varepsilon_n]$, define $\rho_1(x) = 0$ and $\rho_2(x) = \rho(x) - \frac{1}{cx^{1+\alpha}}$. For the case that n is an even number, we can similarly define $\varepsilon_{n+1}, \rho_1(x), \rho_2(x), x \in (\varepsilon_{n+1}, \varepsilon_n]$ but with the places of ρ_1 and ρ_2 switched.

Now for $i = 1, 2$, we let ρ^i be defined as above and let X^i be a pure jump subordinator with the Lévy density ρ^i. By (4.47), we can assume that X^1 and X^2 are independent and $X = X^1 + X^2$. We will show that X^1 satisfies (H). The proof of the validity of (H) for X^2 is similar so we omit it.

Let $n \ge 1$ be an odd number. For $z_{n+1} \le |z| \le z'_{n+1}$, by (4.46), the fact that $\rho_1(x) = 0$ for $x \in (\varepsilon_{n+1}, \varepsilon_n]$, (4.48), (4.51), (4.55) and (4.49), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{X^1}(z) &= |1 + \psi_{X^1}(z)| \\
&\le A_{X^1}(z) + |\mathrm{Im}\psi_{X^1}(z)| \\
&= A_{X^1}(z) + \left|\int_0^1 \sin(zx)\rho^1(x)dx\right| \\
&\le A_{X^1}(z) + \left|\int_0^{\varepsilon_{n+1}} \sin(zx)\rho_1(x)dx\right| + \left|\int_{\varepsilon_n}^1 \sin(zx)\rho_1(x)dx\right| \\
&\quad + \left|\int_0^1 \sin(zx)\frac{1}{2cx^{1+\alpha}}dx\right| \\
&\le A_{X^1}(z) + \int_0^{\varepsilon_{n+1}} \frac{c|z|x}{x^{1+\beta}}dx + 1 + \left(\int_0^{\frac{1}{|z|}} \frac{|z|x}{2cx^{1+\alpha}}dx + \int_{\frac{1}{|z|}}^1 \frac{1}{2cx^{1+\alpha}}dx\right) \\
&= A_{X^1}(z) + \frac{c|z|\varepsilon_{n+1}^{1-\beta}}{1-\beta} + 1 + \left(\frac{|z|^{\alpha}}{2c(1-\alpha)} + \frac{1}{2c\alpha}(|z|^{\alpha} - 1)\right) \\
&\le A_{X^1}(z) + \frac{c}{1-\beta} + 1 + \left(\frac{1}{2c(1-\alpha)} + \frac{1}{2c\alpha}\right)|z|^{\alpha} \\
&\le c^1 A_{X^1}(z),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.56}$$

where $c^1 > 1$ is a constant independent of z and n.

Let ν be a finite measure on $\mathbf{R}$ of finite 1-energy with respect to X^1. Set $y_k = c_1 z_{k+1}^{\beta}$, $k \in \mathbf{N}$. Then, by (4.52)-(4.55), we find that $\{y_k \uparrow \infty\}$ and $y_1 > c_1 > 1$. When k is odd and $y_k \le B_{X^1}(z) < (y_k)^{\varsigma}$, by (4.49), (4.50) and (4.54), we get

$$z_{k+1} \le |z| < z'_{k+1}. \tag{4.57}$$

By (4.56) and (4.57), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k \text{ odd}}^{\infty} \int_{\{y_k \le B_{X^1}(z) < (y_k)^{\varsigma}\}} \frac{1}{B_{X^1}(z)\log(B_{X^1}(z))} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
= & \sum_{k \text{ odd}}^{\infty} \int_{\{y_k \le B_{X^1}(z) < (y_k)^{\varsigma},\, |z| \ge 1\}} \frac{1}{B_{X^1}(z)\log(B_{X^1}(z))} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
& + \sum_{k \text{ odd}}^{\infty} \int_{\{y_k \le B_{X^1}(z) < (y_k)^{\varsigma},\, |z| < 1\}} \frac{1}{B_{X^1}(z)\log(B_{X^1}(z))} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
\le & \sum_{k \text{ odd}}^{\infty} \int_{\{z_{k+1} \le |z| < z'_{k+1}\}} \frac{1}{B_{X^1}(z)\log(c_1)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
& + \int_{\{B_{X^1}(z) \ge c_1,\, |z| < 1\}} \frac{1}{B_{X^1}(z)\log(B_{X^1}(z))} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
\le & \frac{1}{\log(c_1)} \sum_{k \text{ odd}}^{\infty} \int_{\{z_{k+1} \le |z| < z'_{k+1}\}} \frac{c^1 A_{X^1}(z)}{B_{X^1}^2(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
& + \frac{1}{c_1 \log(c_1)} \int_{\{|z|<1\}} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz \\
\le & \frac{c^1}{\log(c_1)} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \frac{A_{X^1}(z)}{B_{X^1}^2(z)} |\hat{\nu}(z)|^2 dz + \frac{(\nu(\mathbf{R}))^2}{c_1 \log c_1} \int_{\{|z|<1\}} dz \\
< & \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence Condition ($\mathrm{C}^{\log}$) is fulfilled. By (4.49) and Hartman and Wintner [9], X_1 has bounded continuous transition densities. Therefore, X^1 satisfies (H) by Theorem 2.3(i). □

Remark 4.3. *By [13, Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.2], Theorem 4.2 still holds if the interval* $(0, 1]$ *in Definition 4.1 is replaced with* $(0, \delta]$ *for any constant* $\delta > 0$.

Theorem 4.2 leads us to consider the following question:

Suppose that X_1 and X_2 are two independent Lévy processes on $\mathbf{R}^n$ such that both of them satisfy (H). Does $X_1 + X_2$ satisfy (H)?

We will consider this question in a forthcoming paper [12].

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank the financial support of NNSFC (Grant No. 11371191) and NSERC (Grant No. 311945-2013).

References

[1] Bertoin J. (1996) *Lévy Processes*. Cambridge Univ. Press.

[2] Blumenthal R.M., Getoor R.K. (1961) Sample functions of stochastic processes with stationary independent increments. J. Math. Mech. **10**, 493-516

[3] Blumenthal R.M., Getoor R.K. (1968) *Markov Processes and Potential Theory*. Academic Press, New York and London.

[4] Blumenthal R.M., Getoor R.K. (1970) Dual processes and potential theory. Proc. 12th Biennial Seminar of the Canadian Math. Congress, 137-156

[5] Fitzsimmons P.J., Kanda M. (1992) On Choquet's dichotomy of capacity for Markov processes. Ann. Probab. **20**, 342-349

[6] Forst G. (1975) The definition of energy in non-symmetric translation invariant Dirichlet spaces. Math. Ann. **216**, 165-172

[7] Glover J. (1983) Topics in energy and potential theory. Seminar on Stochastic Processes, 1982, Birkhäuser, 195-202

[8] Glover J., Rao M. (1986) Hunt's hypothesis (H) and Getoor's conjecture. Ann. Probab. **14**, 1085-1087

[9] Hartman P., Wintner A. (1942) On the infinitesimal generators of integral convolutions. Amer. J. Math. **64**, 273-298

[10] Hawkes J. (1979) Potential theory of Lévy processes. Proc. London Math. Soc. **38**, 335-352

[11] Hu Z.C., Sun W. (2012) Hunt's hypothesis (H) and Getoor's conjecture for Lévy processes. Stoch. Proc. Appl. **122**, 2319-2328

[12] Hu Z.C., Sun W. Hunt's hypothesis (H) for the sum of two independent Lévy processes. In preparation.

[13] Hu Z.C., Sun W., Zhang J. (2015) New results on Hunt's hypothesis (H) for Lévy processes. Potential Anal. **42**, 585-605

[14] Kanda M. (1976) Two theorems on capacity for Markov processes with stationary independent increments. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete **35**, 159-165

[15] Kanda M. (1978) Characterisation of semipolar sets for processes with stationary independent increments. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete **42**, 141-154

[16] Rao M. (1977) On a result of M. Kanda. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete **41**, 35-37

[17] Rao M. (1988) Hunt's hypothesis for Lévy processes. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **104**, 621-624